



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/508,991

05/10/2005

Sebastian Hallensleben

2466-130

1361

23117

7590

07/08/2008

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC  
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR  
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

MANOHARAN, MUTHUSWAMY GANAPATHY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/08/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/508,991	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HALLENSLEBEN, SEBASTIAN	
	<b>Examiner</b> MUTHUSWAMY G. MANOHARAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2617	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-11 and 13-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-11, and 13-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 7 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities: claims 7 and 8 depend on canceled claim 6. Appropriate correction is required. The following art rejection considers claims 7 and 8 are depending on claim 1.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-2,5, 7-8, 10-11 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marley (7139556) in view over Lammi et al. (hereinafter Lammi) (WO 01/28273) and Dutta et al. (hereinafter Dutta) (US 2004/0117370).**

Regarding **claim 1**, Marley teaches a method of exchanging user-specific data ("user's location", item F in Figure 2) from a mobile network to a service application of an external service provider ("ASP", item D in Figure 2), wherein certain user data is needed by the application for providing a requested service to a mobile user, the method comprising the following acts performed by a data control server of the mobile network (Figure 2):

receiving a service request from the mobile user directed to the service application (item A in Figure 1, Col. 1, lines 36-38)

generating a unique Application User Identification (AUID) random code which is assigned to a combination of the mobile user and the service application ("**user tag**", Col. 3, lines 40-47; "**random multi-digit number**", Col. 4, lines 47-48)

sending the service request and the assigned AUID code ("**user tag**", Col. 3, line 42) to the service application ("**network N wishes to ask ASP1 for directions to or locations of the nearest pizza outlet**", Col. 2, lines 56-59),

receiving from the application a request for the user data of said mobile user ("**ASP will at step E request information about user's location from the network N**", Col. 4, lines 1-4),

allowing the service application to receive the requested user data if said assigned AUID code was included in the received user data request ("**ASP will at step E request information about user's location from the network N, using the user tag as a means of relating this request**" Col. 4, lines 1-4)

retrieving the requested user data based on the received AUID code and sending the user data to the application ("**the network responds to this request by providing the location of the user to ASP- that is by defining the geographical area in which the user is currently present. The network knows which user is concerned because it derives this information from the user tag**", Col. 4, lines 5-7).

Marley did not teach specifically code which is assigned when the mobile user has not previously assessed the service application and to obtain the user data in conjunction with any subsequent service request from the mobile station.

However, Lammi teaches in an analogous art a code which is assigned when the mobile user has not previously assessed the service application and to obtain the user data in conjunction with any subsequent service request from the mobile station ("the user identifier and the corresponding anonymous identifier are eliminated from the data base after a predetermined time/(number of tries)", Page 5, lines 34-37 and Page 6, lines 1-4; it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to set the number of tries or the time to a very large number in order to reduce the work load of the network). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the code which is assigned when the mobile user has not previously assessed the service application and to obtain the user data in conjunction with any subsequent service request from the mobile station in order to reduce the work load of the network.

The combinations of Marley and Lammi did teach specifically the method of checking in a permission table whether the service application is allowed to receive the requested user data, said permission table specifying a plural of service applications and a type of data each application is allowed to receive and allowing the service application to receive the requested user data if the service application is allowed to receive the user data according to the permission table. However, Dutta teaches in an analogous art the method of checking in a permission table whether the service

application is allowed to receive the requested user data, said permission table specifying a plural of service applications and a type of data each application is allowed to receive and allowing the service application to receive the requested user data if the service application is allowed to receive the user data according to the permission table (Figure 9A; Paragraph [0108-0111]). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the method the method of checking in a permission table whether the service application is allowed to receive the requested user data, said permission table specifying a plural of service applications and a type of data each application is allowed to receive and allowing the service application to receive the requested user data if the service application is allowed to receive the user data according to the permission table in order to restrict access to private data.

Regarding **claim 2**, Marley teaches a method, wherein the AUID code is generated in response to receiving the service request from the mobile user (Col. 3, lines 35-42).

Regarding **claim 5**, Lammi further teaches the method, wherein the AUID code is used by the application for attributing the retrieved user data sent, to the said service upon subsequent access of the mobile user to the same service (Page 6, lines 1-4).

Regarding **claim 7**, Dutta teaches a method wherein a permission table is maintained for a specific user or group of users (Figure 9A).

Regarding **claim 8**, Dutta teaches a method, wherein an error message is sent to the service application if the service application is not allowed to retrieve the requested user data (Paragraph [0156]).

Regarding **claim 10**, Marley/Lammi further teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising determining whether a valid mobile user identity exists that corresponds to the received AUID code in order to check if the application is authorized (Marley: Col. 4, lines 8-9; Lammi: items 27-29 in Figure 2).

**Claim 11, 18** are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1.

Regarding **claim 16**, Lammi teaches a server according to claim 11, further comprising a mobile network interface for receiving service requests from mobile users, and for retrieving user data ("service gateway"; items 14 in Figure 1).

Regarding **claim 17**, Dutta teaches a method an external provider interface for receiving requests for user data from service applications, and for responding with either the requested data or **an appropriate error message** (Paragraph [0156]).

**Claims 3,4,13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marley (7139556) in view over Lammi et al. (hereinafter Lammi) (WO 01/28273), Dutta et al. (hereinafter Dutta) (US 2004/0117370) and further in view over Krishnamoorthy (US 2003/0115201).**

Regarding **claim 3**, the combination of Marley, Lammi and Dutta teaches all the particulars of the claim except wherein the AUID code is stored in a translation table together with a mobile user identity and an application identity. However, Krishnamoorthy teaches in an analogous art wherein the AUID code is stored in a translation table together with a mobile user identity and an application identity (Paragraph [0042]). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the AUID code is stored in a translation table together with

a mobile user identity and an application identity. This modification is a design choice, since it is up to the data base manager to have all the information in one table or in multiple tables from a single or multiple database located in a single or multiple devices.

Regarding **claim 4**, Lammi further teaches a method, wherein the mobile user identity is obtained from the translation table based on the received AUID code, for retrieving the requested user data from a user database in which user-specific data is stored for mobile users being registered in the mobile network (Abstract; “identification database”; item 13 in Figure 1).

**Claim 13** is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 3.

Regarding **claim 14**, Lammi teaches a server further comprising a translator for translating AUID codes into mobile user identities and vice versa by checking the translation table (Page. 8, lines 13-20; Page. 9, lines 5-10).

**Claims 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marley (7139556) in view over Lammi et al. (hereinafter Lammi) (WO 01/28273), Dutta et al. (hereinafter Dutta) (US 2004/0117370) and Chung (US 2003/0016823).**

Regarding **claim 9**, the combination of Marley, Lammi and Dutta teaches all the particulars of the claim except a method wherein new AUID codes are generated by dividing the decimal representation of a non-periodic irrational number into blocks of a certain length, wherein each block is used as an AUID code. However, Chung teaches in an analogous art, a method wherein new AUID codes are generated by dividing the



decimal representation of a non-periodic irrational number into blocks of a certain length, wherein each block is used as an AUID code (Abstract; Figure 4, Paragraphs [0016-18]). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the method wherein new AUID codes are generated by dividing the decimal representation of a non-periodic irrational number into blocks of a certain length, wherein each block is used as an AUID code. This modification is useful for providing secure (cryptographic applications) communication.

**Claim 15** is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MUTHUSWAMY G. MANOHARAN whose telephone number is (571)272-5515. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-2:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eng George can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617